

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached drawing sheet includes changes to Fig(s) 1, 2 and 3. This sheet replaces the original sheet including Figs. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.

- Fig. 1 has been labeled as "PRIOR ART".
- Fig.2 - element 10 has been identified.
- Fig. 3 - elements 19 and 27 have been identified.

No changes have been made to Figs. 4 and 5.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet  
Annotated Drawing Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS

The Official Action of June 4, 2008, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 2-5, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claim 1 has been canceled in favor of new independent claim 5. Claims 2-5 remain in the application for consideration.

In response to the Examiner's objection to the drawings, Applicant has amended Fig. 1 to indicate that it is prior art. Applicant has further amended the figures to correct and include numerical identification of structural features set out in the claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that the objection to the drawings has now been overcome.

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs, Applicant has canceled original independent claim 1 in favor of new independent claim 5. As the Examiner will note, new claim 5 has been drafted to eliminate reference to "a blind hollow

projection" as the claimed invention is limited to include only the claimed solid projection and hollow insert.

In addition, new claim 5 eliminates reference to the terms "interrupted" and "trunco-conical", and claim 4 has been amended to clarify that the "annular ledges" claimed are ledges other than those set out in claim 1. The basis for this feature is found in the last paragraph of the disclosure on page 7.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's 35 U.S.C §112, first and second paragraph rejections of the claims has now been overcome.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for her indication that claims 1-4 appear to avoid the art of record subject to overcoming the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections which Applicant has submitted has been done, as noted above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-5 are allowable and that this application is now in condition for allowance.


The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Appln. No. 10/530,863  
Amdt. dated September 4, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of June 4, 2008

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are  
earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 

Norman J. Latker

Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197

Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

G:\BN\O\Ocha\OROZ1\Pto\2008-09-04-Amendment.doc

G:\BN\O\Ocha\OROZ1\Pto\2008-09-04-Amendment.doc